Standards Committee meeting

November 12, 2020

1. Updates
	1. Accessions working group and new liaison
		1. Wendy will serve as the Standards liaison to the emerging working group; we’ll appoint someone new for the next couple of years
	2. RiC updates
		1. RiC is publishing a new version of the Ontology and CM by the end of this month for comment again
		2. If we want to provide joint feedback, we could look at forming a group in December
	3. Liaison updates
		1. TS-AFG: Vice President Courtney Chartier has confirmed the full list of recommended appointees to the TS-AFG. Our complete roster was posted on the SAA website on Nov. 6 and they welcomed three new members to the TS-AFG - Susanne, Lisa and Bryan. Michelle is in the process of sending out sections of the standard for review and writing new sections.
		2. EAS: New outreach group is working on webinars for early next year. Looking to do more collaboration with EAS Section. EAC revision is moving forward, call for comment starting in January, with the hopes of releasing around SAA 2021. EAD tag library updates are needed/major-minor revisions. EAD review and revision, with the plan of kicking off next year.
		3. DACS: Matthew is pulling together revised package for Rights Statements for resubmission. Road map for new principles implementation within and beyond the standard.
2. Major/minor revisions
	1. Going to Council this month
3. Regarding proposals
	1. Could we create Google Docs for proposals prior to the meeting for comments on proposals? Yes, definitely!
		1. We will create Google Docs for EAD and CUA proposals for written feedback this week and will plan to vote electronically early next week.
	2. Are reviews and revisions a separate process or do they generally happen together?
		1. We’ve reached out to o SAA governance, and it’s not 100% the case, but sometimes the steps are combined. Most reviews lead to a revision as part of the process.
	3. Reminder that submitting a package to Standards, in addition to publication, is a last step
4. EAD proposal review and vote
	1. Comments:
		1. Timeline organization is a little confusing
			1. Based on anticipated timelines for parts of the work timeline. Month numbers are a guess at indicators for beginning and end dates.
		2. What role will major/minor revision play? This review is for setting up the major revision process of EAD. That shouldn’t impact this proposal.
	2. Feedback for Section:
		1. Create Google Doc to submit comments, vote electronically next week
5. Colleges and University Guidelines proposal review and vote
	1. There have been some failed attempts to revise this standard in the past, which is not in the proposal (Council looked at this in 2005, feedback was provided, but it’s unclear if anything happened after that point.). We need to get some additional information and work with CUAS on this.
	2. Person leading the effort is the early career member, which could also be an issue and may be the driving force behind the aggressive timeline.
	3. Comments:
		1. Timeline may not be generous enough?
			1. Given some previous conversations around gathering feedback, if they were to get enough, they might be successful, but if they have to gather more, it could extend the timeline.
		2. Solicit/consult with people from some smaller institutions, as well as the primarily faculty member they have listed.
		3. Plan might not be as robust as it could be, especially since there hasn’t been an update in 21 years.
		4. Do they have a sustainability plan/plan for future review cycle?
	4. Feedback for Section:
		1. Create Google Doc to submit comments, vote electronically next week
6. Standards portal updates
	1. We’re working on moving the Google Docs content to the spreadsheet and should be able to talk about next steps for contacting sponsors and sorting out orphan works at the December meeting.
7. Other updates
8. Next meeting: December 10, 2020